A RECONSTRUCTION OF THE JUDEAN RESTORATION*

FRANK MOORE CROSS

HARVARD UNIVERSITY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02138

THE literature dealing with the fifth and fourth centuries in Palestine appears to expand by geometric progression. I think it is fair to say, however, that little progress has been made in solving the hard problems in the history of the Restoration since the assimilation of new evidence from the Elephantine papyri published in 1911.[1] If one compares the review of literature on the date of Ezra's mission by H. H. Rowley published in 1948[2] and the review by Ulrich Kellermann in 1968,[3] one comes away disappointed; a generation of research has added at best a few plausible speculations,[4] but little, if any, hard new evidence. The scholarly procedure has been to review the same body of evidence and arguments and come boldly down on one of three dates for Ezra in relation to Nehemiah: (1) Ezra came before Nehemiah, a view we may label "the traditional view"; (2) Ezra came after Nehemiah, which for convenience we may call the "Van Hoonacker position"; (3) Ezra came during or between Nehemiah's visits to Jerusalem, the "Kosters-Bertholet view." To these we should add the position of C. C. Torrey that Ezra was a fiction of the Chronicler's imagination and, consequently, had no date. Some scholars refuse

[1] I refer in particular to *AP* 21, 30, 31, 32 (*AP* = A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century* B.C. [Oxford: Clarendon, 1923; reprinted, Osnabrück: Zeller, 1967]).

[2] "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," republished in *The Servant of the Lord* (2d ed.; Oxford: Blackwell, 1965) 137-68 (first published in *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume* [eds. S. Löwinger and J. Somogyi; Budapest: Globus, 1948], 1. 117-49); cf. "Nehemiah's Mission and Its Background," *BJRL* 37 (1955) 528-61; and "Sanballaṭ and the Samaritan Temple," *BJRL* 38 (1955) 166-98.

[3] "Erwägungen zum Problem der Esradatierung," *ZAW* 80 (1968) 55-87; and "Erwägungen zum Esragesetz," *ZAW* 80 (1968) 373-85.

[4] We should place J. Morgenstern's proposals ("The Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah," *JSS* 7 [1962] 1-11) and Morton Smith's assertions (*Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* [New York: Columbia University, 1971] 99-147) in the category of the less than plausible speculations. Smith is certainly correct, however, in recognizing that "arguments from personal names (of which Rowley makes much) are generally worthless because of the frequency of papponomy at this period, and the frequency of most of the names concerned" (p. 252 n. 109).

* The Presidential Address delivered 25 October 1974, at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, held at the Washington-Hilton, Washington, D.C.

© *1975, by the Society of Biblical Literature*

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

to commit themselves in print, and others shift back and forth between two or more views — a decade, let us say, to Van Hoonacker, a decade to Bertholet or the traditional view.[5]

The time has come, however, for the study of the era of the Restoration to take new directions. Over the last twenty years tidbits of new evidence have accumulated and now, when brought together, give new contexts or perspectives with which to approach old problems. None of these bits of new evidence is particularly dramatic or conclusive. Taken together, however, they provide new solutions which can move the present discussion out of stalemate.

The discovery in 1962 of fourth-century legal papyri executed in Samaria is perhaps the most important source of new data.[6] From the papyri we can reconstruct the sequence of governors in Samaria by virtue of the practice of papponymy, the naming of a child after his grandfather (see the appended genealogical chart). The Samaritan genealogy overlaps with the genealogies of the Judean Restoration from the sixth to the tenth generation after the return. Sanballaṭ I, the Ḥoronite, is the founder of the dynasty, as his gentilic suggests, the contemporary of Nehemiah and 'Elyašīb, as biblical references make clear, and the contemporary of the high priests Yōyada' and Yōḥanan, as we can deduce from biblical and Elephantine references.[7] The Sanballaṭ of Josephus proves to be Sanballaṭ III, the contemporary of Darius III and Alexander, the builder of the Samaritan temple on Gerizim.[8] Equally important, the sequence of Sanballaṭids makes certain what has long been suspected, that two generations are missing in the biblical genealogy of Jewish high priests.[9] This lacuna in the fourth century is supplied by Josephus, who is correct in his record that a certain Yōḥanan killed his brother Yēšūa' in the temple in the time of the infamous Bagoas, the commander-in-chief of Artaxerxes III (Ochus, 358-38 B.C.) in his expeditions to Phoenicia, Palestine, and Egypt during the western insurrections,[10] and that Yōḥanan's successor was Yaddūa', high priest in the days of Darius III (335-30) and Alexander.[11] In short, we can now reconstitute the end of the list of high priests as follows: Yōḥanan father of Yaddūa',

[5] This last-mentioned option, I must confess, is the one I have chosen. It at least has the advantage of giving variety.

[6] See F. M. Cross, "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dâliyeh: A Preliminary Report on Their Discovery and Significance," *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology* (eds. D. N. Freedman and J. C. Greenfield; Garden City: Doubleday, 1969) 41-62. A first volume of the final report is now in press.

[7] *AP* 30:29 and *AP* 30:18.

[8] *Ant* 11.7, 2 §302-3; 11.8, 2 §306-12; 11.8, 4 §325. Sanballaṭ III died in 332 B.C., of an age to have had a marriageable daughter.

[9] 1 Chr 5:41; Neh 3:1, 21; 12:10, 22-23; 13:4; Ezra 10:6.

[10] Most of us have assumed that Josephus confused Bagoas the general with Bagoas (*bgwhy*) of *AP* 30–32, a successor to Nehemiah, as governor of Judah; it proves to be an instance of hypercritical presumption on our part.

[11] *Ant.* 11.7, 2 §302-3; 11.8, 2 §306-12; 11.8, 7 §347. Yaddūa' died, we are told (11.8, 7 §347), ca. 323 B.C. (the time of Alexander's death).

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

Yaddūa' father of Onias I.[12] Or in other words, in the sequence Yōḥanan, Yaddūa', Yōḥanan, Yaddūa' there has been a simple haplography with the loss of two names, in extremely easy consequence of the device of papponymy. Whether Josephus' list of high priests was defective or he merely telescoped the genealogy in writing the history of the fifth-fourth centuries, it is clear that he confused Yaddūa' II and Yaddūa' III as well as Sanballaṭ I and Sanballaṭ III with diabolical results for the history of the Restoration. Thus the Yaddūa' of Neh 12:10, 22 (Yaddūa' II, the grandson of Yōyada', the first of the name)[13] is correctly attributed to the time of Darius II (Nothus 423-404) in the Bible, and the Yaddūa' of the *Antiquities* is correctly attributed by Josephus to the time of Alexander. Similarly, we can observe that Josephus is probably correct in his remark that "Israelites" (i.e., Yahwists of Samaria) frequently intermarried with the high-priestly family in Jerusalem.[14] At least two instances must be admitted, the son of Yōyada' I, who married the daughter of Sanballaṭ I,[15] and Manasseh the brother of Yaddūa' III, who married Nikasō the daughter of Sanballaṭ III.[16] The narratives of these two marriages can no longer be regarded as the reflexes of a single instance of intermarriage. This circumstance is not unimportant in assessing the "Zadokite" character of Samaritan religion or in reconstructing the relations between Samaria and Jerusalem in the era of the Restoration. The Tobiads of Ammon appear to have enjoyed similar relations with the ruling priestly family of Jerusalem despite Nehemiah's polemics.[17]

The practice of papponymy in ruling houses of the Persian period has long been recognized. Still, new evidence for its practice has drawn our attention more sharply to its importance as a control in reconstructing genealogies. If B. Mazar's reconstruction is correct, the name Tobiah alternates over nine generations of Tobiads.[18] In a newly published Ammonite inscription the royal name 'Ammīnadab alternates over six generations.[19] Sanballaṭ repeats over six generations at Samaria, and if our reconstruction of the Judean family of high priests is correct, the name Yōḥanan (or the caritative Ḥōnay) occurs no fewer

[12] As we shall see, Onias I (ibid.) is in fact Yōḥanan IV. The name Onias is the Greek form of Hebrew Ḥōnay (byform: Ḥōnī), a typical hypocoristicon of the pattern *qutay* used for so-called biconsonantal roots. Both the name Ḥōnay and the pattern *qutay* are well known at Elephantine as well as later. Cf. M. H. Silverman, *Jewish Personal Names in the Elephantine Documents* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1967) 95-96 and references. The name Ḥōnay is, in fact, merely the caritative or diminutive of Yōḥanan. Similarly, *yaddūa'* is the *qattūl* hypocoristicon, a caritative of Yōyada'.

[13] See the discussion in n. 11.

[14] *Ant.* 11.8, 2 §312.

[15] Neh 13:28.

[16] *Ant.* 11.8, 2 §306-12. See the discussion in "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dâliyeh," 54-55.

[17] Neh 13:4-9.

[18] B. Mazar, "The Tobiads," *IEJ* 7 (1957) 137-45, 229-38.

[19] See F. M. Cross, "Notes on the Ammonite Inscription from Tell Sīrān," *BASOR* 212 (1973) 12-15.

3 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

than seven times over twelve generations. Over against this, happily, the royal house of Judah does not practice papponymy in the first seven generations of the Restoration, giving us a measure of control over the parallel list of high priests, as we shall see.

The dating of Nehemiah's mission to 445, the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I, has not been in serious dispute since the appearance of Sanballaṭ in an Elephantine letter of 407 B.C. The new list of Sanballaṭids further confirms the fifth-century date, and finally the discovery of a silver bowl inscribed by "Qaynu son of Gašm [biblical Gešem, Gašmu],[20] king of Qedar,"[21] would appear to settle the matter finally.[22] The script of the bowl cannot be dated later than 400 B.C., placing Geshem, Qaynu's father, precisely in the second half of the fifth century B.C.

Another series of advances has been made in the developing study of the Greek versions of Ezra, notably in the recognition of the importance of the text of 1 Esdras for historical reconstruction. H. H. Howorth, C. C. Torrey, and S. Mowinckel have pioneered in these studies.[23] With the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, and their evidence for the history of Hebrew textual families, earlier views of the importance and priority of the Hebrew recension of Ezra underlying the Greek of 1 Esdras have been vindicated. The relation of the two recensions of Ezra, one preserved in the Palestinian text known from Qumran Cave 4 (4QEzra) and from the Masoretic text, the other preserved in the Alexandrian translation of an Egyptian text type (1 Esdras), has an almost precise analogy in the two recensions of Jeremiah, the long and the short, both preserved in Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran, 4QJer[a], the Palestinian text preserved in the

[20] Neh 2:19; 6:1-2, 6.

[21] The bowl was published with other finds in the Wādī Ṭumeilāt by Isaac Rabinowitz, "Aramaic Inscriptions of the Fifth Century B.C.E. from a North-Arab Shrine in Egypt," *JNES* 15 (1956) 1-9. He dates the script of the bowl to ca. 400 B.C., a date I should term correct but minimal. See also W. J. Dumbrell, "The Tell el-Maskhuṭa Bowls and the 'Kingdom' of Qedar in the Persian Period," *BASOR* 203 (1971) 33-44. The discovery of the bowl supports the fifth-century dating of an early Liḥyanite inscription from El-'Ulā (Dedan), which mentions Gašm bin Šahr and 'Abd, governor (*paḥat*) of Dedan, a dating held by Winnett and Albright against strong opposition. See W. F. Albright, "Dedan," *Geschichte und Altes Testament* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 16; Tübingen: Mohr, 1953) 1-12, esp. p. 4 and n. 5. Albright's conjecture that the biblical formula *ṭwbyh hᶜbd hᶜmny* (Neh 2:10, 19) should be read *ṭwbyhw wᶜbd hᶜmny* (with the haplography of a single *waw*) is most tempting. It would not be strange at all if ᶜAbd, a Persian governor of Dedan, were an Ammonite and associated on the one side with Tobiah of Ammon, and Geshem, the Arab king of Qedar.

[22] It must be observed, however, that there is evidence of papponymy in the Qedarite house. See Albright, "Dedan," 6-7.

[23] See especially Torrey's *Ezra Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1910); and S. Mowinckel, *Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemiah* (3 vols.; Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1964-65). The citation of 1 Esdras is from the excellent new critical edition of R. Hanhart, *Esdrae Liber 1* (Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum graecum, 8/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

later Masoretic text, and 4QJer[b], the Egyptian text found also in the Old Greek translation of Jeremiah. The Egyptian textual tradition is pristine, short, and follows an earlier ordering of chapters; the Palestinian textual family is expansive and conflate, with its ordering of pericopes secondary.[24] Ralph Klein has brought together the evidence for the two recensions of Ezra.[25] The Palestinian recension is conflate, expansionistic, and follows a late, secondary ordering of pericopes. It is reflected in 4QEzra, in Esdras B, a Palestinian translation by a forerunner of the school of Theodotion,[26] and in the rabbinic recension which developed into the Masoretic text. The Egyptian textual family is reflected in 1 Esdras, translated in Egypt in the mid-second century B.C.[27] In parallel passages, 1 Esdras proves on the whole to have a shorter, better text, and, as generally recognized, its order of pericopes reflects an older, historically superior recension of the Chronicler's work (Chronicles, Ezra). Most important, 7:72b through 8:12 of Nehemiah (1 Esdr 9:37-55) is placed immediately after Ezra 10 (1 Esdr 8:88–9:36). That is to say, the entire Ezra-narrative is separated wholly from the memoirs of Nehemiah. Thus it must be said that in an earlier recension of the Chronicler's work, the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah did not overlap. Moreover, in 1 Esdr 9:49 (= Neh 8:9) the name "Nehemiah" is missing in the description of the reading of the law; there is only reference to the *Tiršātā*. That the name Nehemiah does not belong here is also evidenced by the chronological problem developed thereby: thirteen years would have passed between Ezra's return and the reading of the law that he brought with him—presuming the chronology of the final edition of the Chronicler's work. In short, we must consider it a fixed point in the discussion that the Ezra-narrative has no mention of Nehemiah in its original form and that the Nehemiah-memoirs contain no reference to Ezra.[28]

1 Esdras completes the Ezra-narrative (save for a fragment at its close) now found in Neh 8:13-18, the account of preparations for and the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles. Evidently, the end of the scroll of 1 Esdras, which became the archetype of the Greek text of 1 Esdras, was defective. The reading

[24] The evidence is fully presented by J. Gerald Janzen, *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (Harvard Semitic Monographs, 6; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1973). See also E. Tov, "L'incidence de la critique textuelle sur la critique littéraire dans le livre de Jérémie," *RB* 79 (1972) 189-99.

[25] "Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler" (Cambridge, MA: unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1966). A summary can be found in *HTR* 59 (1966) 449; see also his paper "Old Readings in 1 Esdras: The List of Returnees from Babylon (Ezra 2 = Nehemiah 7)," *HTR* 62 (1969) 99-107.

[26] The translator of 2 Esdras is not Theodotion (*contra* Torrey), nor is he identical with the so-called *καίγε* recension, though he shares some of the latter's traits.

[27] See the arguments of Klein in the work cited in n. 25.

[28] The appearance of the name Nehemiah in Neh 10:1, of Ezra in Neh 12:36, and the mention of both in Neh 12:25 all stem from the hand of the editor of the final edition of the Chronicler's work (Chr_3, see below).

5 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

of the Law and the celebration of the high holidays[29] were the appropriate climax and conclusion. That one recension of the Chronicler's work ended at the close of ch. 8 of Nehemiah (i.e., at the end of the original ch. 9 of 1 Esdras) is confirmed by the text of 1 Esdras used by Josephus, who carries the story of Ezra, following precisely the order of 1 Esdras through ch. 8 of Nehemiah, including the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles.[30] As we shall see, the Chronicler's work once circulated with only the Ezra-narrative appended. The Nehemiah-memoirs were not part of the work but were circulated separately. Josephus knew a Greek translation (no doubt Alexandrian) of the Nehemiah-memoirs quite different from the received text of Nehemiah. However, the integration of the Nehemiah-memoirs into the Chronicler's history belongs to the latest stage of revisions of the Chronicler's work and did not finally oust the earlier recension until the rabbinic recension of the first century of the Christian era became authoritative following the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70.

1. *Reconstruction of the List of High Priests in the Fifth Century* B.C.

We have discussed the problems of the fourth-century sequence of high priests, restoring a haplography of Yōḥanan and Yaddūa' on the basis of data from the new list of Sanballaṭids and from the *Antiquities* of Josephus. The genealogy of the priests from the sixth to the fourth centuries without the addition of Yōḥanan (III) and Yaddūa' (III) records eight generations for a period of 275 years. This yields the figure of 34.3 years per generation, an incredibly high figure. In Near Eastern antiquity, the generation (i.e., the years between a man's birth and his begetting his first-born son) is ordinarily 25 years or less. The inclusion of the priests, Yōḥanan and Yaddūa', reduces the average generation to about 27.5, still suspiciously high.

The genealogy of the Davidids gives a measure of control for the first seven generations of the Restoration and, happily, does not follow the fashion of papponymy, so that the risk of names lost by haplography is slight. In any case, it appears to be complete. The list names seven Davidids, six generations of the Restoration. These occupy a period of years from before 592 (the thirteenth year of Nebuchadrezzar), to ca. 445 B.C., the birth date, roughly, of 'Ananī, a total of 147 years. This gives the figure of 24.5 years per generation, which is close to what we should expect. Synchronisms exist for two or three of the

[29] Apropos of the high holidays, there is no reason to suppose that Ezra followed a pre-pentateuchal calendar, moving up *Sukkôt* and ignoring *Yôm Kippûr* (*pace* Morton Smith). Preparations for *Sukkôt* took more than one day.

[30] There is no allusion in Josephus to the covenant-document preserved in Nehemiah 9 (historical prologue in the form of a confession) and 10 (witnesses and stipulations). The chapters belong to the latest stratum of the Chronicler's history (Chr_3); it is not clear whether it is an expanded doublet of Ezra's covenant (Ezra 10:3-5) or represents a parallel covenant enacted by Nehemiah. The stipulations conform closely to Nehemiah's reforms. Greek Nehemiah (Esdras B) attributes the confession to Ezra (at 19:6 = Hebr. 9:6).

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

generations of the Davidids. Zerubbabel and Yēšūa', the high priest, are linked. Ḥaṭṭūš returned with Ezra.[31] 'Ananī, the last of the line recorded in 1 Chr 3:17-24, *may* be the 'Ananī named in *AP* 30:19 (410 B.C.); on the other hand, his brother *'wštn* mentioned in the papyrus is not listed among his six brothers in 1 Chronicles 3 by the Persian name.

The list of high priests in the sixth-fifth century, from Yōṣadaq to Yōḥanan, extends over a period of 150 years.[32] Six priests are named in the five generations giving the figure of 30 years per generation, some five years or more per generation too high. We suspect that at least one generation, two high priests' names, has dropped out of the list through a haplography owing to the repetition produced by papponymy.

Turning to the list, we note that the first three names appear to be in order. Yōṣadaq went captive.[33] Yēšūa' and his son Yōyaqīm returned with Zerubbabel.[34] Similarly, the last three names — Yōyada', Yōḥanan, Yaddūa' — seem to be correct.[35] The center of difficulties, however, is the high priest 'Elyašīb. As brother of Yōyaqīm, in the third generation of the Return, he should have been born about 545 B.C. This would make him 100 and more, when he built the wall of Jerusalem with Nehemiah,[36] and about seventy-five, when he begot Yōyada'. The key to the solution, however, is in the juxtaposition of the priests Yōḥanan son of 'Elyašīb[37] and Yōyada' son of 'Elyašīb.[38] We must reckon with two high priests named 'Elyašīb, and given papponymy, two priests named Yōḥanan. Thus we have the following sequence: (1) 'Elyašīb I,[39] father of (2) Yōḥanan I, the contemporary of Ezra, followed by (3) 'Elyašīb II, contemporary of Nehemiah and father of (4) Yōḥanan II. Evidently, one pair fell out of the list by haplography. This reconstruction solves all chronological problems. The

[31] Ezra 8:2.

[32] We reckon from 595 B.C., a minimal birthdate of Yōṣadaq, who went into captivity (1 Chr 5:41; cf. *Ant.* 20.10, 2 §231, 234; and 1 Esdr 5:5), to the birth of Yōḥanan ca. 445. In Neh 12:22 Yōḥanan (along with Yaddūa') is said to have flourished in the reign of Darius (II, Nothus, 423-404 B.C.), and he (Yōḥanan) is high priest in 410 B.C. according to *AP* 30:18.

[33] 1 Chr 5:41.

[34] The key passage, to which we shall return, is 1 Esdr 5:5-6, which dates Zerubbabel's return in "the second year," i.e., the second year of Darius I, 520 B.C. The text is slightly in disorder. It should read: Yēšūa' the son of Yōṣadaq the son of Śarayah and Yōyaqīm his son and Zerubbabel. . . ." Cf. *Ant.* 11.5, 1 §121; 11.5, 5 §158.

[35] Neh 12:10, 22.

[36] Neh 3:1, 21; cf. 13:4.

[37] Ezra 10:6; Neh 12:23.

[38] Neh 12:10, 22. It is possible, even likely, given the practice of papponymy, that 'Elyašīb the father of Yōyada' (who succeeded him) had an older son Yōḥanan, who died young or for some other reason did not succeed to the high-priestly office. This would explain the intrusion of the Yōyada'-Yaddūa' sequence of names. This does not solve our problems of chronology; it still leaves a lacuna in the list.

[39] Given the change of names and the requirements of chronology, it is likely that 'Elyašīb I is the brother of Yōyaqīm, or in any case belonged to the same generation.

7 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

list of high priests from Yōṣadaq to Yōḥanan II spans 150 years, a generation averaging 25 years (see chart).

More important, it places the mission of Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes I, 458 B.C.,[40] and the mission of Nehemiah in 445 B.C., the twentieth year of Artaxerxes I.[41]

2. *Editions of the Chronicler's Work*

We have noted above the evidence from 1 Esdras and from Josephus' *Antiquities* that in an earlier edition of the Chronicler's work the narrative of Ezra and the memoirs of Nehemiah were separate and that in all likelihood Nehemiah's memoirs were only attached to the Chronicler's work in its final edition. Confirmation of this view may be found now in Neh 12:23. We read: "the sons of Levi, the heads of fathers' houses, were written in the Book of Chronicles (*sēpẹr dibrê hay-yāmîm*) even until the days of Yōḥanan the son of 'Elyašīb." In this text there is evidently a reference to an edition of the Chronicler's work which ended in the days of Yōḥanan son of 'Elyašīb, the contemporary of Ezra, in the fourth generation of the Restoration, according to my reconstruction. Thus this earlier edition reached only the era of Ezra and Yōḥanan I, and not to the era of 'Elyašīb II, the son of Yōḥanan I, who was high priest in the days of Nehemiah's governorship. Our conclusion that Nehemiah's memoirs were composed and circulated independently of the Chronicler's work also gives an explanation of the repetition of the list of those who returned with Zerubbabel in Ezra 2 (1 Esdr 5:7-47) and in Nehemiah 7. The Nehemiah-memoirs quote the Chronicler's work or draw on a common source at the time when Nehemiah was composed as an independent work.

The evidence for the two editions described above appears clear enough; however, there are also good reasons to posit three editions of the Chronicler's work. We shall label them Chr_1, Chr_2, and Chr_3.

Chr_3 is the final edition, made up of 1 Chronicles 1–9 + 1 Chr 10:1–2 Chr 36:23 + Hebrew Ezra-Nehemiah. Chr_2 includes 1 Chronicles 10–2 Chronicles 34 + the *Vorlage* of 1 Esdras. The two editions differ at the beginning, Chr_3 introducing the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1–9. The latest member of the high priesthood mentioned within the Esdras narrative is Yōḥanan I, son of 'Elyašīb I (1 Esdr 9:1), and the latest member of the Davidic house named is Ḥaṭṭūš (1 Esdr 8:29). On the other hand, in the introductory genealogies of 1 Chronicles 1–9, the list of Davidids continues on two generations to 'Ananī, the contemporary of Yōḥanan II and probably also the contemporary of Yaddūa' II toward the end of the fifth century. Chs. 12 and 13 of Nehemiah refer to these two priests as well; moreover, Neh 12:22 names Darius II (423-404 B.C.) in its latest references to a Persian king. These dates in Chr_3 all stop at the same

[40] The seventh year is given in Ezra 7:7 and again in 7:8.

[41] Or more precisely, December, 445. Cf. Neh 1:1 and Neh 13:6 (the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes I, 433-32).

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

time, shortly before 400 B.C. These data suggest dates for Chr_2 and Chr_3, the former toward 450 B.C., the latter toward 400 B.C. or slightly later.

Other arguments can be put forth for dating Chr_3 to ca. 400 B.C. No hint of the conquest of Alexander is to be found, and perhaps more important, no reference to the suffering and chaos of the mid-fourth century B.C., when Judah joined in the Phoenician rebellion,[42] harshly put down by Artaxerxes III and his general, Bagoas.

A surprising contrast between Chr_2 and Chr_3 is in the treatment of Zerubbabel. Ezra intrudes the list of those who returned with Zerubbabel at ch. 2, making it appear that both Sin-ab-uṣur (Σαναβασσαρ)[43] and Zerubbabel returned more or less together in the reign of Cyrus. The 1 Esdras account places the list of returnees in ch. 5 after the return of Sanabassar in the days of Cyrus and after the narrative recounting Zerubbabel's return to Jerusalem in the second year of Darius.[44] This appears in a *plus*[45] in 1 Esdras and is almost surely authentic. Since we are told that Sin-ab-uṣur, the governor, returned and built the foundations of the temple, and since Zerubbabel completed the temple upon Darius' decree,[46] it is quite natural to attribute the return of Zerubbabel to the beginning of the reign of Darius. The chaos which marked the beginning of Darius' reign was the appropriate time for a return to Zion, as it was an appropriate time for prophets to arise anew and proclaim a new David and a new temple, i.e., the re-establishment of the Judean kingdom. Again, the wisdom tale of Zerubbabel's brilliance and reward in 1 Esdr 3:1–5:6 is fixed unalterably in the reign of Darius. 1 Esdr 4:56 says explicitly that the building of the temple began in the second year after he came to Jerusalem. At the same time, there is a conflict between the account of Zerubbabel's being rewarded by Darius with "letters for him and all the treasurers and governors and captains and satraps" and the Aramaic source in Ezra 5 where Darius, before answering Tattenay the "governor of 'Abar-nahara" and his companions, is said to search out his records for the decree of Cyrus. There can be little doubt that the wisdom-tale is secondarily attached to Zerubbabel and interpolated at some point into one recension of the Chronicler's work.[47]

David Noel Freedman has written a persuasive paper sketching the Chronicler's purpose.[48] If he is correct, we must posit a still earlier edition of the

[42] For the extent of the rebellion and evidence of destroyed cities in Palestine in this period, see D. Barag, "The Effects of the Tennes Rebellion on Palestine," *BASOR* 183 (1966) 6-12.

[43] As has long been argued by W. F. Albright, *ššbṣr* (Ezra 1:8, 11), *šn'ṣr* (1 Chr 3:17), and Σαναβασσαρ all reflect Sin-ab-uṣur, a well-known name-type; Sin-ab-uṣur, Sin-apal-uṣur, and Sin-aḫ-uṣur are all documented in cuneiform sources.

[44] 1 Esdr 5:6; cf. 5:2.

[45] 1 Esdr 4:58–5:7.

[46] Ezra 5:16-20; 1 Esdr 6:18-20.

[47] We are inclined to believe that this happened after Chr_1, before Chr_2, and that Chr_3 suppressed the tale in accord with his anti-monarchic, theocratic views (see below).

[48] "The Chronicler's Purpose," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 436-42.

9 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

Chronicler's work, Chr_1. He contends that "the Chronicler establishes through his narrative of the reigns of David and Solomon the proper, legitimate pattern of institutions and their personnel for the people of God; and they are the monarchy represented by David and his house, the priesthood by Zadok and his descendants, the city and the temple in the promised land. City and ruler, temple and priest — these appear to be the fixed points around which the Chronicler constructs his history and his theology."[49]

The ideology of the Chronicler found in Chr_1, i.e., in 1 Chronicles 10–2 Chronicles 34 plus the *Vorlage* of 1 Esdr 1:1–5:65 (= 2 Chr 34:1 through Ezra 3:13), calls upon the old royal ideology of the Judean kings — chosen David, chosen Zion — as that ideology has been reformulated in Ezekiel 40–48, and especially in the oracles of Haggai and Zechariah. In Haggai and Zechariah, king and high priest constitute a diarchy, son of David, son of Zadok. Zerubbabel is called "my servant" by Yahweh and told, "[I] will make you as a signet; for I have chosen you."[50] In ch. 3 of Zechariah, Joshua the priest is crowned and robed for office in the prophet's vision, and the angel of Yahweh announces: "Hear now, O Joshua the high priest, you and your fellows who sit before you ..., for behold I shall bring my servant, the Branch ...."[51] In Chr_1 "the parallel between the first building of the temple under the direction of David (and Solomon), and the second building under Zerubbabel is too striking to be accidental, and must have formed part of the original structure of the work."[52] In short, the original Chronicler's work was designed to support the program for the restoration of the kingdom under Zerubbabel. Its extent reached only to Ezra 3:13 (1 Esdr 5:65), with the account of the celebration of the founding of the Second Temple. The future is open, and the work of restoring the ancient institutions is well begun; all is anticipation.[53] Here the program or propaganda document should end.

In order to supply the full story of the completion of the temple, the editor of Chr_2 added the Aramaic source in Ezra 5:1–6:19 as the preface to the Ezra-narrative which begins at Ezra 7:1. Chr_2 still breathes some of the monarchist fire of Chr_1. Zerubbabel is called the "servant of the Lord."[54] The story of his wisdom is preserved[55] by Chr_2, and the proper order of the Ezra-narrative is kept for the most part, found now only in 1 Esdras. The Nehemiah-memoirs were introduced only by Chr_3, who, following his belief that Ezra and Nehemiah were contemporaries, created confusion by interlarding the Nehemiah-memoirs with part of the Ezra-narrative. To Chr_3 we are indebted for the genealogies

[49] "The Chronicler's Purpose," 437-38.

[50] Hag 2:23.

[51] Zech 3:8; cf. 4:14.

[52] "The Chronicler's Purpose," 439-40.

[53] Here I cannot agree with Freedman that the original story of Zerubbabel is suppressed in favor of the Aramaic source (Ezra 4:6–6:18).

[54] 1 Esdr 6:27; the parallel passage in Ezra 6:7 suppresses this exalted title.

[55] See above, esp. n. 47.

10 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

of 1 Chronicles 1–9. On the other hand, Chr_3 apparently suppressed elements exalting Zerubbabel, including his title "servant of the Lord" and the heroic tale of Zerubbabel's wisdom and piety (1 Esdr 3:1–5:2).

The primary argument which may be brought against our view of the original Chronicler's work is that the Ezra-narrative and even the Ezra-memoirs reflect the characteristic language and style of the Chronicler.[56] The argument is not compelling; a member of the school of the Chronicler (i.e., Chr_2), imitating the master's style, may easily be responsible for the similarity of style. The two editions of the deuteronomistic history provide a perfect analogy.[57] Moreover, Sara Japhet has recently attacked the thesis of the common authorship of Chronicles and the Ezra-narrative[58] with persuasive evidence of differences of style and linguistic usage. On the other hand, there seem to be distinctions to be drawn between the royal ideology of the Chronicler (Chr_1) and the final edition of his work (Chr_3). Chr_3 appears to have omitted some material which tends to exalt Zerubbabel, the anointed son of David, presumably because his movement was snuffed out and his end ignominious or pathetic.[59]

In summary we may list three editions of the Chronicler's work, Chr_1 composed in support of Zerubbabel shortly after 520 B.C., Chr_2 written after Ezra's mission in 458 B.C., and Chr_3 edited about 400 B.C. or shortly thereafter.[60]

[56] The strongest statement of this view is perhaps that of C. C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 238-48.

[57] See F. M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1973) 274-89.

[58] S. Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," *VT* 18 (1968) 330-71. Some of her arguments are based on distinctions between different orthographic practice and the use of archaic or pseudo-archaic forms; these arguments do not hold, I believe, as can be seen by an examination of the two Isaiah scrolls of Qumran Cave 1, or a comparison of 4QSam[a] and 4QSam[b], where common authorship is certain.

[59] In "The Purpose of the Chronicler" (p. 440), Freedman argues that in the final edition of the Chronicler's work (he reckons with only two editions), there is a positively anti-monarchical, clericalist tendency. However, none of his arguments is particularly strong.

[60] The fact that all genealogies in Chr_3 end shortly before 400 B.C. virtually eliminates the popular view that Ezra followed Nehemiah in the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes II, 398 B.C. Of the many arguments brought forward to support the position that Ezra followed Nehemiah to Jerusalem, most are without weight. The most plausible of them, perhaps, is the notice in Ezra 9:9 that God has given "to us a *gādēr* in Judah and in Jerusalem." The term *gādēr* has been taken sometimes as a reference to the city wall of Jerusalem. It must be said that there may have been attempts to build the wall of Jerusalem before Nehemiah succeeded. This would explain his surprise at his brother Ḥananī's report that "the wall of Jerusalem (*ḥwmt yrwšlm*) is shattered" (Neh 1:3). On the other hand, it is by no means clear that the term *gādēr* here refers to a city wall. Ordinarily, it refers to an "enclosure wall" (of fields or vineyards) or "fortifications." Thus it refers to the enclosure wall which fortified the temple (Ezek 42:7 and *gdrt*, Ezek 42:12). In Mic 7:11 the expression is used in the plural, *gdryk*, and evidently refers generally to the defenses or fortifications of a city. Specifically in Ezra 9:9, how-

11 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

3. *A Sketch of the Era of the Restoration*

In the first year of his reign, 538 B.C., Cyrus the Great published an edict directing the temple in Jerusalem to be rebuilt, returning the sacred vessels taken as loot by Nebuchadrezzar to their place, thereby initiating the restoration of the Jewish community.[61] The leader of the first return was Sin-ab-uṣur, the heir to the house of David, son of Jehoiachin. He is given the title *nāśîʾ*, which Ezekiel and his circle in the Exile preferred to *mẹlẹk,* "king," in designating the new David's office. Beyond the fact that Sin-ab-uṣur led a group of captive Jews to Jerusalem bearing the temple treasures, we know very little. Evidently it was a token return, for we know that a large number of Jews were flourishing in the Babylonian community under the tolerant Persian regime. Sin-ab-uṣur is credited with laying the foundations of the temple in the Aramaic source,[62] as well as being named governor.[63] Since the Persian administration frequently appointed a member of the native royal house as governor of a local state, and indeed made the governorship hereditary, there is no reason to doubt the notice. In any case, his nephew Zerubbabel succeeded to the governorship of Judah.

Zerubbabel the governor and Jeshua the Zadokite high priest, according to 1 Esdras, returned at the beginning of the reign of Darius.[64] This was a time of widespread rebellion in the Persian empire, and in Judah a nationalist spirit stirred up the populace. The prophets Haggai and Zechariah arose and gave oracles reviving the old royal ideology of king and temple. Zerubbabel and Jeshua were named the new David and new Zadok, the "sons of oil," and a program was promulgated to re-establish Israel's legitimate institutions. Above all, the prophets urged the building of the temple and envisioned the return of Yahweh's "glory" to Jerusalem, there to "tabernacle" as in ancient days. Haggai prophesied the downfall of the Persian empire and blamed the little community's troubles on their failure to build the house of God.

In support of the messianic movement the Chronicler composed a history which reviewed and reshaped Israel's historical traditions to give urgency and meaning to the tasks at hand, the restoration of the Davidic rule, the building of the temple, and establishment of the divinely appointed cult with all its kindred institutions and personnel. This first edition of the Chronicler's work is to be dated to the five-year interval between the founding of the temple and the completion of the temple (520-15 B.C.).

ever, the context is quite clear. In rhetorical parallelism, Ezra speaks of "raising the house of our God," "making its ruins stand up," and "giving us a *gādēr* in Jerusalem and Judah." As Ezekiel uses *gādēr* of the temple-fortification, so does Ezra speak of the *gādēr* of the temple. Each parallel refers to Zerubbabel's temple and its enclosure wall. The temple was, of course, a bastion as well as a sanctuary.

[61] The Aramaic text is found in Ezra 6:3-5; compare the ornamented version in Ezra 1:1-4.

[62] Ezra 5:16.

[63] Ezra 5:14.

[64] The floating piece in 1 Esdr 5:63-70 (= Ezra 4:1-5) appears self-contradictory; cf. 1 Esdr 5:1-6.

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

In the face of harassment by Persian officials, including the satrap of Syria, and the jealousy and hostility of peoples who surrounded Judah, Zerubbabel and his party completed the temple on 12 March 515. The service of God "as it is written in the book of Moses" was thus restored.

We then hear no more of Zerubbabel. The prophecies of glory, wealth, and peace faded away into silence. We have no hint of Zerubbabel's fate. More than half a century passes before the story of the Restoration is taken up again. This gap in the record is significant also in reconstructing the history of the Chronicler's work. When the record resumes with the narrative of the mission of Ezra, the messianic themes of the earlier narrative are no longer to be heard. Hierocracy supplants the diarchy of king and high priest. We hear nothing of the Davidic prince either in the Ezra-narrative or in the memoirs of Nehemiah.

In 458 B.C. "Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of the heaven," set out with his company of Zionists, armed only with Artaxerxes' commission, some offerings sent to the temple in Jerusalem, and the Book of the Law. Ezra's first major effort on his arrival in Jerusalem was to undertake stern action against intermarriage with foreigners, especially marriage to foreign wives. He proposed that all enter into a covenant to put away foreign wives, and the issue of such marriages, in fulfillment of the Law. Armed with royal authority to appoint magistrates and judges, he vigorously pressed the reform against all opposition. Two months after he arrived in Jerusalem, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, in the seventh month, on New Year's Day, he gathered all the people in an assembly before the Water Gate, and standing on a wooden pulpit read from "the book of the Law of Moses." We judge this book to have been the Pentateuch in penultimate form.[65] On a second day, he read from the Law and then dismissed the congregation in order that they might prepare for the Festival of Succoth.[66]

Here ended the second edition of the Chronicler's work, the recension reflected in 1 Esdras, combining the Ezra-narrative with the older Book of Chronicles. The date of Chr_2 must fall about 450 B.C.

In 445, Nehemiah, the cupbearer to king Artaxerxes I, learned of the troubles of the restored community in Jerusalem and its defenselessness. With the king's commission as governor of Judah, he set out with a contingent of the king's cavalry for Jerusalem.[67] Spying out the city by night, he kept his own counsel as to his plans, knowing full well that his mission would be hindered by the hatred and schemes of his fellow governors round about, viz., Sanballaṭ, governor of Samaria, Ṭobiah, governor of Ammon, Gašmu, the king of the

[65] The arguments of S. Mowinckel are compelling; see *Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemia*, 3. 124-41.

[66] Mowinckel is surely right in assuming that the Day of Atonement was fully known and celebrated despite the omission of reference to it in Nehemiah 8.

[67] Josephus (*Ant.* 11.5, 7 §168) gives 440 as the date of Nehemiah's arrival in Jerusalem. The wall was completed in December, 437 B.C., according to Josephus (*Ant.* 11.5, 8 §179), two years and four months after he began.

13 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

CHART OF THE HIGH PRIESTS OF THE RESTORATION AND OF THEIR CONTEMPORARIES

Generation of High Priests	*Generation of Davidids*	*Generation of Sanballaṭids*
1. Yōṣadaq before 587	1. Sin-ab-uṣur b. before 592 (13th year)	
father of	uncle of	
2. Yēšūa' b. ca. 570	2. Zerubbabel b. ca. 570	
father of	father of	
3. Yōyaqīm b. ca. 545	3. Ḥananyah b. ca. 545	
(brother of)	father of	
[3. 'Elyašīb I b. ca. 545]		
(father of)		
[4. Yōḥanan I b. ca. 520]	4. Šekanyah b. ca. 520	
(father of)	father of	
5. 'Elyašīb II b. ca. 495	5. Ḥaṭṭūš b. ca. 495	
father of	uncle of	
6. Yōyada' I b. ca. 470	6. 'Elyō'enay b. ca. 470	6. Sanballaṭ I b. ca 485
father of	father of	father of
7. Yōḥanan II b. ca. 445	7. 'Ananī b. ca. 445	7. Delayah b. ca. 460
(AP 30.18)	(cf. AP 30.19)	father of
father of		
8. Yaddūa' II b. ca. 420		8. Sanballaṭ II b. ca. 435
father of		father of
		9. Yēšū'a (?) b. ca. 410
		brother of
[9. Yōḥanan III b. ca. 395]		9. Yēšūa' (?) b. ca. 410
father of		father of
[10. Yaddūa' III b. ca. 370]		10. Sanballaṭ III b. ca. 385
father of		d. 332
11. Onias I b. ca. 345 (= Yōḥanan IV)		
father of		
12. Šim'ōn I b. ca. 320		

Qedarite Arabs, and perhaps 'Abd, the governor of Dedan. Upon his announcement of plans to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, supported by 'Elyašīb II, the high priest, he was accused by the neighboring governors of rebellion against the king. When work began the governors took action and conspired to send contingents of their troops to harry them. Nehemiah countered these devices by arming his workers, so that a worker "with one of his hands worked, and with the other grasped his weapon." Ultimately, the walls were finished in fifty-two days of labor (Neh 6:15), though work must have continued longer to complete the details of the fortifications,[68] and a service of dedication was held with processions and singing to the sound of harps and cymbals. With his primary task completed, Nehemiah returned to the king in 433 B.C., leaving his brother behind to rule in his stead. On his return he appears to have carried out a number of reform measures: enforcing the payment of tithes for the benefit of Levite

[68] See n. 67 above and W. F. Albright, *The Biblical Period* (Pittsburgh: Private Distribution, 1950) 51-52.

Journal of Biblical Literature 94.01 Pp. 4-18 © 2004, ATLA Serials http://63.136.1.23/pls/eli/pshow?lcookie=&pid=1804730&lmode=S&lpo...

and singer, and preventing the violation of the Sabbath, including the hawking of merchandise by Phoenicians on the Sabbath. Like Ezra, he attempted to put an end to foreign marriage, a perennial problem, it appears. The final words of his memoirs are these: "Thus I cleansed them from all that was foreign .... Remember me, O my God, for good."[69]

The memoirs of Nehemiah here briefly summarized must have been composed and circulated in the late fifth century. Toward 400 B.C. a final editor combined the Nehemiah-memoirs with the Chronicler's work (Chr_2), prefixed a collection of genealogies (1 Chronicles 1–9) and otherwise edited the whole. Again, darkness falls so far as the Bible is concerned, and the history of the fourth century remains a virtual blank until the advent of Alexander III of Macedon.

[69] Neh 13:30-31. It is often said that it is unlikely that great Ezra so failed in his reform that Nehemiah was required to institute a similar reform. But in the Bible the great leaders, Moses and the prophets, regularly fail, or to take a closer analogy, the deuteronomistic reforms of Hezekiah and Josiah certainly were short-lived. Moreover, laws against intermarriage are notoriously difficult to enforce in any age.

15 of 15 4/29/2005 6:15 AM